



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,496	08/22/2003	James C. Bedingfield SR.	030161 (BLL-0101)	9667
23413	7590	10/24/2006	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002		PATEL, HEMANT SHANTILAL		
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2614		

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/646,496	BEDINGFIELD, JAMES C.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hemant Patel	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Applicant Response dated September 11, 2006 to an Office Action dated May 11, 2006 is entered. Claims 1-5, 7-19 are pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 13-14, 17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushnell (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0120504 A1), and further in view of Mitchell (US Patent No. 5,651,053).

Regarding claim 1, Bushnell teaches a method for providing a privacy management service in a telephone system by using originating calls to build a database of acceptable incoming calls, said method comprising:

detecting a telephone call from a subscriber telephone number to a called party telephone number, wherein said initiating is performed by a subscriber (Paragrpaah 0019, subscriber originates a call to a called party and dials a telephone number);

Art Unit: 2614

determining if said called party telephone number is located in a subscriber database of telephone numbers corresponding to said subscriber telephone number (Paragrpah 0019, system 150 at step 205 checks to see if the called number of the associated outgoing call is in the subscriber's directory);

adding said called party telephone number to said subscriber database in response to said determining resulting in not locating said called party telephone number in said subscriber database (Paragrpah 0019, if the called number is not in the subscriber's database, system adds the called number to the subscriber's database); and

connecting said telephone call between said subscriber telephone number and said called party telephone number (Paragrpah 0019, the call is completed by the telephone switching system).

Bushnell does not teach of using the subscriber telephone list for screening incoming calls such that a call from a caller with a telephone number on the subscriber's list of telephone numbers is directly connected to the subscriber, otherwise the call is processed by the screening application.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Mitchell teaches of adding a telephone number to the subscriber's special caller list (Abstract, II. 13-15; col. 1, II. 60-63; Fig. 3, step 19; Figs. 6-7, the refusal list replaced by special caller list) to whom call was placed by the subscriber and enabling preferred callers to reach the subscriber without being screened (Abstract). All other callers are subjected to screening that involves prompting the caller to record his/her name and playing this recorded name to the subscriber to

accept the call, refuse the call or divert the caller to leave a recorded message for later retrieval by the subscriber (Abstract, II. 6-11).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bushnell to include selective call screening as taught by Mitchell in order to handle calls from preferred callers immediately but “politely refuse unwanted calls” (Mitchell, col. 1, II. 15-16).

Regarding claim 2, Bushnell teaches a method of inquiring subscriber database by sending both the calling number and called number (Paragraph 0019).

Regarding claims 3, Mitchell teaches of a method of transmitting an inquiry transaction via a signaling transfer point to a service control point and said service control point is in communication with said subscriber database (col. 2, II. 38-41; col. 3, II. 37-44).

Regarding claim 4, refer to rejection for claim 3.

Regarding claim 5, Mitchell teaches of a method wherein said adding is performed via a signaling transfer point and a service control point in communication with said subscriber database (Fig. 1, items 40, 36-38; IP 40 as CSIP adds telephone number to the list in database at SCP 39).

Regarding claim 7, refer to rejection for claim 1.

Regarding claim 9, Bushnell teaches of a system for providing a privacy management service by using originating calls to build a database of acceptable incoming calls in a telephone system having a service switching point in communication

with a subscriber telephone having a subscriber telephone number, and a service control point in communication with the service switching point, said system comprising:

an off-hook delay trigger provisioned on the subscriber line at the service switching point for triggering a query to the service control point whenever a telephone call from the subscriber telephone number to a called party number is detected (Paragraph 0019, the telephone switching system 110 sends both the calling number and called number to the Click to Dial Favorites System 150);

a subscriber database of telephone numbers in communication with the service control point (Fig. 1, item 152); and

a service package application on the service control point for responding to the query by determining whether the called party number is located in the subscriber database, wherein:

when the called party number is not located in the subscriber database, the service package application adds the called party number to the subscriber database and routes the telephone call to the called party number (Paragrpah 0019, if the called number is not in the subscriber's database, system adds the called number to the subscriber's database); and

when the called party number is located in the subscriber database, the service package application routes the call to the called party number (Paragrpah 0019, the call is completed by the telephone switching system).

Bushnell does not teach of using the subscriber telephone list for screening incoming calls such that a call from a caller with a telephone number on the subscriber's

list of telephone numbers is directly connected to the subscriber, otherwise the call is processed by the screening application.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Mitchell teaches of adding a telephone number to the subscriber's special caller list (Abstract, II. 13-15; col. 1, II. 60-63; Fig. 3, step 19; Figs. 6-7, the refusal list replaced by special caller list) to whom call was placed by the subscriber and enabling preferred callers to reach the subscriber without being screened (Abstract). All other callers are subjected to screening that involves prompting the caller to record his/her name and playing this recorded name to the subscriber to accept the call, refuse the call or divert the caller to leave a recorded message for later retrieval by the subscriber (Abstract, II. 6-11).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bushnell to include selective call screening as taught by Mitchell in order to handle calls from preferred callers immediately but "politely refuse unwanted calls" (Mitchell, col. 1, II. 15-16).

Regarding claim 10, refer to rejection for claim 9 and claim 3 and claim 4.

Regarding claim 11, Bushnell further teaches that the network is IP (Internet Protocol) data network, which connects telephone switching system, Click to Dial Favorites System, Telephone Directory Search Engine (Paragrpah 0021).

Regarding claims 13, 14, Bushnell discloses a system wherein subscriber database (Fig. 1, item 152) is in direct communication with service control point (Fig. 1, item 151).

Regarding claim 17, Bushnell discloses a user system (Fig. 1, items 101B, 102B, 103B) in communication with subscriber database for updating said subscriber database (Paragraphs 0021-0022).

Regarding claim 19, it recites a computer program product that substantially performs a method as claimed in claim 1. Bushnell discloses a system with components that use computer program product as is well known in the art (Fig. 1; Paragraphs 0015-0016). Refer to rejection for claim 1.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushnell and Mitchell as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Lection (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0096046 A1).

Regarding claim 8, Bushnell teaches of adding caller telephone number to subscriber database (Paragrph 0018, if the calling number is not in the subscriber's database, system adds the calling number to the subscriber's database).

Bushnell and Mitchell do not teach of a screening option of always answering a call and connecting the calling party to called subscriber.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Lection teaches of automatically answering the telephone call if the caller identification data (calling line number) matches an entry in the screening list maintained for the subscriber (Paragrph 0023).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bushnell and Mitchell to automatically answer the call from the caller on approved list as taught by Lection in order to provide "the hands-free

Art Unit: 2614

management of a telephone call without requiring the called party 170 to view the display of the handset 160, or to use the hands of the called party 170" (Lection, Paragraph 0025).

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushnell and Mitchell as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Miller (US Patent No. 6,944,184 B1).

Regarding claim 12, Bushnell and Mitchell do not teach of TCP.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Miller teaches of using TCP/IP to connect database and SCP (col. 2, ll. 40-46).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bushnell and Mitchell to connect subscriber database to SCP using TCP/IP as taught by Miller in order to provide "a method of connecting to SCP units that does not require dedicated, expensive SS7 signaling links" (Miller, col. 4, ll. 3-5).

7. Claims 15-16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushnell and Mitchell as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Weinman (US Patent No. 6,658,455 B1).

Regarding claim 15, Bushnell and Mitchell do not teach that the subscriber database is a relational database.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Weinman teaches of a database (Fig. 1, item 110) that is relational (Fig. 1, items 105, 106, relates data in personal rule base with data in personal storage directory).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bushnell and Mitchell with a database that is related to each other as taught by Weinman in order to arrange data separately according to their function and thus keep each data entity manageable in size and hence to save real-time when referring to any data in it.

Regarding claim 16, Bushnell and Mitchell do not teach that the subscriber database is accessed through a server.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Weinman teaches that the subscriber database (Fig. 1, item 110) is accessed via a server (Fig. 1, item 115) (col. 1, ll. 61-col. 12, ll. 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bushnell and Mitchell with a database that is accessed via a server as taught by Weinman so that the server “regulates information flow” (Weinman, col. 11, ll. 63) according to the requestor’s access level as is known in the art.

Regarding claim 18, Bushnell teaches a user system (Fig. 1, items 101B, 102B, 103B) in communication with subscriber database (Fig. 1, item 150) via a network (Also, Mitchell, Fig. 1).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. 6,160,877	Tatchell
US Patent No. 6,363,411	Dugan
US Patent No. 6,418,211	Irvin
US Patent No. 6,549,619	Bell
US Patent No. 6,631,182	Schwab

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hemant Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-8620. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hemant Patel
Examiner
Art Unit 2614

HSP

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600
